DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 086 415 RC 007 565

AUTHOR Lynch, Patrick D.
TITLE American Indian Education: Separation, Amalgamation, or What?
PUB DATE 21 Mar 73
NOTE 15p.; Paper presented at the American Association of School Administrators, Annual Convention (105th, San Francisco, California, March 17-21, 1973)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *American Indians; Boarding Schools; *Community Control; *Educational Objectives; *Educational Resources; Educational Responsibility; Legal Responsibility; *Post Secondary Education; Reservations (Indian)
IDENTIFIERS American Association of School Administrators

ABSTRACT

The essay is concerned with what happens to American Indian students after grade 12. What students do once they have completed grade 12 determines what kind of educational system is to be built. However, in the case of minorities, especially Native Americans, professionals have assumed that schools are socialization agencies, that they are terminal institutions, and that skills are secondary to socialization. A school system needs both ends and means, but schools for Indian children lack ends. The discussion of post high school institutions is not so much a criticism of existing or projected programs as a questioning of ends. It appears that decisions have been made about where Indian students are going mainly on the basis of means. Too often institutional functions replace goals or ends as the most important concern of policy makers. The essay emphasizes that means should be subordinated to ends, not the other way around. (FF)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS
105th Annual Convention
San Francisco, Calif. March 17-21, 1973

SPEAKER: Patrick D. Lynch, Chairman, Department of Educational Administration, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa.

TOPIC: AMERICAN INDIAN EDUCATION: SEPARATION, AMALGAMATION, OR WHAT?

PLACE: Room 407-9, Civic Auditorium

TIME: Tuesday, March 20, 2:30 P.M.

PROGRAM: Page 71

FOR RELEASE UPON DELIVERY

ED 086415
RECEIVED
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY
RC007565

Concern about what happens to Indian students after grade twelve would have seemed to be a fatuous question a few years ago. The greatest concern a few years ago was how to help the largest possible number of Indian students to finish elementary and secondary school. That problem still taxes our ingenuity and imagination, not to say available resources. The problem of how to build an educational system which helps the largest possible number of students to finish elementary and secondary school is a problem partly of program and resources, and partly a problem of goals. The problem of program and resources is related to and dependent upon the goals of the educational system. What students do once they have completed grade twelve is a question which determines what kind of system is to be built. The kinds of reforms needed in a system which is seen as an end in itself are partly the same and partly different from the kinds of reform needed in a system which prepares students for another kind of training.

A K-12 system in which we concentrate on means and not on ends is a school system which is more concerned about staff needs rather than the needs or ends perceived by clients who are parents, students, and community. Means, as I use the term, are concerned with the functioning of the system, its program, and its resources. Ends, as I use the term, are the goals of the system--ends answer the question of what is it all for? Where do the kids go from here?

With means uppermost in mind we think mainly about inputs to the exclusion of outputs. A means centered system is concerned with such

-more-

problems as staff benefits, allocation of power within the system and how to control students without reference to client concerns or desires.

A concern for goals or ends brings with it discussion of results, output, or accountability of a system. Accountability mechanisms are really those directed toward ends. Clients ask questions about ends, and ideally present ends for the system to aim toward. The means are supplied by professionals. Properly, the professionals address themselves to the means needed to accomplish ends desired by clients, community or public.

You can't have ends in a school system without means. But in schools for minority children, especially those for Native American children, ends have been ignored. Means have been emphasized--inputs such as numbers of children, their characteristics, their place of residence, the number of dollars available, the classrooms available (no matter how far from a student's home), and the number of teachers available have been manipulated without reference to the ends of education.

Of course if you say that all schools have had the means-ends problem, you are right. The schools for minorities are no exception. But in the case of schools for minorities, there has been far less attention to the ends of education relative to the means than has been the case in middle class schools. In the middle class schools, it has been widely assumed that schooling does not end with grade 12. Parents and boards have too often assumed that all schools are prep schools and professionals have consented to this relationship between means and ends. But in the case of minorities, especially Native Americans, professionals have assumed that schools are socialization agencies, that they are terminal institutions, that skills are secondary to socialization, that at best an occupation of low income awaits the 12th grade graduate. The Abt report published in 1969 is witness to the dichotomy in expectation between

Indian parent and student on the one hand and BIA professionals on the other. The professionals saw socialization as the school's purpose, while the parent and child felt skills were the schools main purpose. The professionals were looking from within, at the means used in schooling, while parents and students were looking outside, at the ends.

With the rapid expansion of post high school educational opportunity, since 1968, the following trends can be identified in American Indian education:

1. Scholarship programs have increased significantly. These scholarships are largely available for students enrolling in four year institutions, although their real purpose is unclear.
2. Grant programs to institutions of higher education to prepare students for special occupations and skills have proliferated.
3. Three Bureau of Indian Affairs institutions house post high school programs which might be called junior college programs. Two of these are viewed by some professionals as having four year potential. But those three institutions have a large number of professionals who treat the students as boarding school students no differently from high school students.
4. Native operated institutions have been established, including community colleges, Navajo Community College, Canado College, and D-Z College.
5. At least one Bureau high school will begin a vocational technical program in 1973-74, and several others are considering such programs.

The flowering of post high school educational opportunity is surely advantageous to Native students. The more types of opportunities, the more likely a student will find an alternative to his liking and tailored to his

objectives. Some questions related to the ends come to mind concerning post high school education:

1. As community colleges are established, and scholarship funds are used to finance these colleges, is opportunity being enlarged or just changed? Are community colleges an alternative to four-year college programs or will they replace four-year opportunities for Native students? Community colleges, if they are segregated racially, are also largely segregated by economic class and by objective. That is, community colleges do not always provide a flow-through possibility for students who decide on a four-year degree program. Community colleges are fine institutions, but if they mainly accommodate occupational goals of a blue-collar, or lower, grade, and adults who wish enrichment, they will not necessarily serve those students who change occupational goals as they learn more about themselves and about occupational records and demands. Community colleges may become segregated catch-basins for minorities who can't pass through on the way to a bachelor's degree. Community colleges might be seen by their staff, like high schools, as mainly socialization institutions instead of skill-imparting institutions. This process would leave the four-year institutions as the nesting grounds of the middle class and the reservoirs of higher level skills.
2. As scholarship funds are used to support community colleges, and diminish as opportunities for entry to four-year institutions, then the four-year institutions revert to a middle-class, white institution much as they were before the equal educational opportunity thrust of the late 1960's. Native Americans will become again rare birds in the halls of ivy.

-more-

3. Grant programs to higher educational institutions are being cut back. The effect will be to diminish opportunities for formation of Native American professionals, and ultimately to leave those roles, even in supposedly Native American institutions to non-Indians, or at least to slow up the process of self-determination. Self-determination begins at the bottom and at the top at the same time. It requires lay direction for institutions and professionals sensitized to and loyal to the lay tribal members. If resources are diverted from pre-professional and professional programs to community colleges, you observe a policy shift, with the implications mentioned above. It isn't just a money shortage we are witnessing, but a decrease in one kind of spending accompanied by an increase of another kind. That means a policy shift. If the resources are shifted from grant programs which prepare administrators, lawyers, teachers, health personnel, and businessmen to community college programs the shift is from preparing policy implementers to a trickle-up theory. The trickle-up theory characterized education of Native Americans up until roughly 1969. The theory is that if you prepare enough people at the lowest possible educational level, eventually a few will seep up to upper levels. Along the way they will be well socialized into the system norms, not the norms or aims of the people who are served by the institutions.
4. As Bureau of Indian Affairs high schools add on vocational technical programs of a post high school nature they necessarily drop their emphases upon general preparation in order to enhance job preparation. A worthy change, unless one examines carefully where high school students are going who might have gone to these schools. And a

worthy change provided that it is established by firm data that fewer high school spaces are needed and more vocational technical spaces are desired by students. Are students prepared by the high schools better fitted for vocational-technical education and more desirous of their kind of education than for college courses? It would seem obviously that this is so, but does the Native American community place that high a priority on vocational technical skills over college entrance skills? Does a close relationship between high school and vocational technical programs in the Bureau schools going to be accompanied with and conscientious preparation for students for four-year college programs? Or will the temptation for professionals be to fasten on means--the "obvious' preparation for typical Native students will be to prepare them for vocational-technical programs and to ignore the ends of both high school and vocational technical preparation. Will the establishment of more vocational technical programs closely coordinated with Bureau high schools entice the high schools to give up on preparing students with skills and hand this job to public schools, which may also decide this task as being too hard to prepare Native students with appropriate skills for college training. In summary, will an emphasis in vocational-technical preparation narrow the opportunities now open to Native students for professional preparation?

5. If the two year Bureau institutions become four-year institutions, will these be specialized schools or general education institutions? Right now the two-year institutions have not had time to articulate their programs with a variety of four-year institutions, public and private, which would open up opportunities of many kinds for their

students. If one or more of these institutions become four-year institutions, it means very likely that the scholarship program which allows students to choose their institution will be further restricted. Perhaps only a very limited elite of Native students would then be allowed a real choice among institutions.

The foregoing discussion of post high school institution is meant not so much to be a criticism of existing or projected programs as raising questions about ends. Have decisions been made about where Native students are going mainly on the basis of means? It appears so. It appears that too often institutional functions replace goals or ends as the most important concern of policy maker. Means should be subordinated to ends, not the other way around. A sociologist would say that long-range goals are being replaced by more immediate ones of caring for staff preferences and institutional preferences. This happens easily and often because professionals naturally drift into making goal decisions because of their domination of the means or internal functions of an organization. Goals are external to an organization, they are the property of society, not the organization. They present challenges to professionals to rearrange the organization so as to serve client desires. When an organization neglects ends and concentrates on means, the means become the ends.

The history of organizations shows us that means quickly replace ends. The charitable organization soon begins to worry more about fund raising in order to keep its staff and property intact than it does how to help the orphans, hungry, crippled, needy youth, or scholarship recipients for which it was organized. Some charitable organizations which advertise the needy Indian children in the New York Times or Washington Post can't find "qualified Indians" to serve on their boards to help make decisions about how to serve

clients. The school staff which is more concerned about how to keep itself in operation than what kind of skills that its clients want is falling into the old trap of replacing ends with means.

There appears to be a powerful position being shaped which denies the ability of the institutionalized school to do anything other than focusing on means. I refer to an article in the March Atlantic Monthly by Godfrey Hodgson which comments upon the work of Coleman, Jensen, Moynihan, and Jencks. The argument is something like this; the school appears to be unable to teach skills to lower income youth. Family income appears to be the most powerful determinant of success in school. The low income student is very likely to finish the sixth grade farther behind the middle class child than he was in grade three, and overwhelmingly likely to finish twelfth grade farther behind the middle class child than he was in the sixth grade. Jensen argues that the Black child is in bad shape because he is Black, as well as being poor, according to test result. Poor is bad, broken family membership is worse, and non-white affiliation with both of those really makes one a loser.

So where does this leave the school? Jencks and Ilich claim that the era of the school is ended, that it is time for a replacement. But the replacement sounds suspiciously like a bureaucratic organization, as likely to become a closed system as a school, and once closed, offering fewer alternatives.

Some professional critics have given up on the power of the schools to educate minority kids to something higher than a blue collar life, or even that high.

The arguments of Jencks and Ilich are addressed to ends. But they proceed from the premise that we give up on the fashioning of means since it appears that we have run out of alternative means. The ends proposed

are properly the responsibility of society. If the professionals give up on fashioning menas to achieve ends desired by the school's constituency, it surrenders what is properly the professionals' roles. It is really begging the question for professionals to say "it's all over--we can't do it." The research into the comparison of ends or goals of schools with means or the comparison of input and actual output to desired output or target is just beginning. It is hardly the time to throw it aside and beg the question of ends.

The decisions regarding ends are for society and its constituent communities. If communities are to make intelligent decisions regarding ends they must have information related to means and ends. The choices for ends cannot be made without a definition of certain kinds of means related to ends. The variety of means is so far limited by research and professional creativity. Means include programs invented by professionals, and the measures supposedly appropriate to the criteria for measuring programs were invented by professionals. The programs have changed somewhat during the 1960's. They have in fact flourished. But the measures of the programs have not changed. We are still using measures highly correlated with Binet's instrument developed and refined in the first two decades of this century. We haven't been nearly as creative in developing instrumentation for measuring program output as we have been in developing educational programs. It is highly probable that no matter what kind of program we invest that it gives greater success to middle class white kids than to lower class non-white kids. The despair of the professionals who would write a policy of custodial schools comes from the problem of a highly tenuous relationship between programs and the measures supposedly appropriate to measure them.

-more-

To argue that we should give up on developing programs for developing skills for a broad spectrum of students because they help middle class students more than lower economic class students is similar to arguing that since highways benefit teachers more than automobile owners that we should quit building highways. Maybe we should give up building highways but we shouldn't give up for that reason. If we can't devise a better system of levying support for transportation services then we are indeed bankrupt.

Programs need to be devised and support patterns for schools need drastically to be devised because they are an instrumentality of society. The schools are not an end in themselves and programs are not an end in themselves. They are means society uses toward certain ends. There are other means than schools which might be used to accomplish the ends of providing people with job entry skills, college entrance skills, and citizenship participative skills, but we have to identify these other means before we throw out the means we have.

The role of educating children can be successfully taken over by Indian people--that much is clear. Programs being developed at Ramah, Rocky Boy and elsewhere are evidence that a new process can be invented by Indian people who control their schools. But the school as an institution is not being thrown out in favor of informal education. Informal education the minute it becomes systematized is no longer informal. Programs alternative to the public schools programs are being developed by Indian people, which will require observation and measurement to determine their effectiveness relative to skills and other goals stated by the community for their school. We can anticipate now that if the measures used are standardized tests that the results probably will not be impressive. So let's be prepared with other kinds of evaluation of the output. Of course these other kinds of evaluations

have to be related to ends determined for those schools. Those schools, not all schools. What ends are those determined by the tribe--such as understanding Indian culture, social, governmental, and ecological matrix of the tribe, the kinds of skills necessary to participate in and manipulate society, the goal of depending on and helping others, those might be examples which require different kinds of tests than we now use. Standardized achievement tests don't help much in measuring these goals. Other goals might be process goals, not output type goals. It might be that Indian people regard the fact that a certain process as continuing without collapsing is itself a criterion to be measured. Involving tribal professionals and non-professionals in education, following and participating in setting tribal goals, helping the community, keeping children near home instead of away from home, all might be legitimate goals outsiders would consider as intermediate but which a tribe might consider as legitimately a set of outcomes of their school system. Playing participative roles in the school community might be more of an end than a means in many communities. If we reflect on the roles of school boards in the past two centuries in American life it has been said that they have provided a powerful school for democracy at the grass roots level. So the experience of Indian groups to participate in control of education might be construed as a means of training the community to order its destiny.

In the case of certain schools, depending on the community's agenda the accomplishment of certain means might become one of the ends. Provided, of course that that is what the community intends, that substitution of certain means as ends isn't the same as the professionals who substitute their means for ends. There is a difference in time framework and control. The community will likely regard the establishment of certain kinds of programs and control mechanisms as partial ends. It is not likely that the community

would entirely ignore the ends of skill preparation entirely, at least for very long. The question of control is also crucial. The establishment of control or participation in educational decision-making can become an immediate end, but once accomplished. the community's newly exercised power will likely allow it to look toward why the school is there--what does the community desire from it.

So Jencks, Ilich and Company are missing a great part of the argument. While they seem to be arguing against institutionalized schooling as if they were advocating for the layman, they are mistaken. Both are professionals and are arguing a professional's surrender to the fates. Neither appears to be acquainted with the difficulties of building programs. Those like Bremer who argue the value of alternative schools are not despairing of a schooling framework and are more realistic. At least they have tried something--they have been in the messy world of means and know how tough it is to fashion alternative means of education.

Given the context of decision making with regard to means and ends as I have been describing it, these are two dimensions to schooling-preparation for something and an immediate set of goals. The preparation of Native American students for something beyond high school is for Native communities to decide, to influence, and to monitor. The question of separation or amalgamation is one of those which the community must answer. One can conceive a decision matrix in which the decisions of separation or amalgamation is set against immediate or long term goals. For accomplishing long term goals of certain kinds of blue collar and professional preparation, certain kinds of decisions are required for appropriate means in the school.

Let's call this group of decisions about means <u>set three</u>, under the long range column and in the (top) separation row. These set of means calls for

preparation of students for professional and non-professional positions primarily within the Indian community, to serve that community. Programs for this set of means include those which prepare students with skills and get them ready for a variety of post high school institutions, along with the kinds of knowledge of the culture to allow them to perform their occupations within the context of the Native community. The decisions regarding this kind of preparation includes decisions on the availability of post high school educational opportunity as well as what goes on in elementary and secondary education.

Cell four includes a set of long range decisions about means related to amalgamation. These include means related to preparing students for occupational roles integrated into society. Again the decisions affect post high school opportunity as well as elementary and secondary education.

Cell one includes those decisions about means related to what happens to students more immediately in the school and community, from a segregation point of view. These decisions relate to training students in their culture. The means may be those proper to a formal school or may be those appropriate to the cultural machinery of the tribe in which there are teaching roles outside the classroom.

Cell two includes those decisions about the means of education appropriate to short range goals related to amalgamation. I hesitate to use the word assimilation because the right terms and their synonyms must be agreed upon by the community. For urban Indian groups, amalgamation is a fact. The urban community decides to what extent it wishes to amalgamate, by what means, how fast, and for what purpose. In each cell there are sets of decisions, not single decisions, as the entire process is too complex to compress into one decision about means. The second cell may be the

toughest to conceptualize, because it includes short term means preparing students to survive culturally, but in a societal setting more corrosive of cultural values of a community than in a separate, or reservation setting.

DECISION MATRIX FOR MEANS
RELATED TO INDIAN EDUCATION

	Short Range	Long Range
Separation	1	3
Amalgamation	2	4

Some decisions about means may be found in more than one cell. The design simply is used to point out that complex decisions about a variety of means have to be taken relating to higher education as well as elementary and secondary education. The decisions about elementary and secondary education cannot be separated from the sets of decisions made about post high school education. Students begin to move toward occupational roles early; decisions made about opportunities for post high school education may place constraints upon student choices as they are being formed early in high school. Decisions students make in high school, and decisions made about elementary and secondary programs affect student mobility into post high school education.

No evaluation of the success of Indian education can be made without looking at the freedom of movement of students from secondary to post-secondary education. If decisions about higher education take into account both long range and short range goals, then the fashioning of means will be seen as the very complex and essential task that it is and professionals must dig into that kind of work if they are to serve. They can't surrender

to nihilism on the basis of incomplete and premature findings using instruments unrelated to the means or the ends.

###